

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in a condition for allowance in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 8, and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura (JP 54-48348) in view of (JP 63-174296), DeRemer (US 4,307,285) and Miller (US 4,463,239). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. The cited combination of references fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious that “the opening area of the electricity feeding port at a position proximate to the center of the ceiling wall reaches one end of the waveguide, and the opening area of the electricity feeding port at a position remote from the center of the ceiling wall does not reach the other end of the waveguide,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 12. With the recited configuration, the directional characteristic of irradiated microwave toward the center of the heating chamber is maximized, thereby efficiently heating the food therein. In contrast, when the opening area of the electricity feeding port at a position remote from the center of the ceiling wall does not reach the other end of the waveguide, the directional characteristic of irradiated microwave toward rear part of the heating chamber is decreased. Because none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 12, the combined references cannot render obvious such claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

With regard to claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious that “a center axis of the heating member is constituted to be more proximate to a line equally dividing the ceiling wall into two in a front and rear direction than a center axis line in a width direction of the upper wave guide arranged at the ceiling wall.” The upper wave guide of Yoshimura extends in a depth direction from the rear of the heating chamber toward the front of the microwave. Arranged in this manner, the upper wave guide of Yoshimura necessarily crosses the claimed line equally dividing the ceiling wall into two in a front and rear direction. Thus, the center axis line of the upper wave guide is more proximate to the line equally dividing the ceiling wall into two in a front and rear direction, in contrast to claim 8.

For at least this reason, the combination of references fails to teach every claimed feature recited in claim 8 as required to maintain a rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

With regard to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable that “the heating member is positioned such that a horizontal centerline of the heating member is located above the opening areas of the feeding ports.” On the contrary, Fig. 2 of JP 63-174296 actually teaches away from the subject matter recited in claim 11 by clearly showing the entire heating element 18, including the horizontal centerline of the heating member 18, mounted well below the opening areas of the feeding ports 17. The other figures in JP 63-174296 are top (or bottom) views, and thus, convey no information about the elevation of the heating member (18 or 20) relative to the opening areas of the feeding ports. And since DeRemer and Miller fail to disclose the combination of a heating member with an opening area of a feeding port, they also fail to teach the position of the heating member therein relative to an opening area of a feeding port. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the combination of references fails to teach every claimed feature recited in claim 11 as required to maintain a rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited in the Office action fail to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable new claims 13 and 14 that require “the magnetron is disposed adjacent to the side surface at the lateral side of the heating chamber and adjacent an end of the side wave guide that is extended away from the upper wave guide.” The references fail to disclose the side wave guide at the lateral side of the heating chamber extending from an upper wave guide. It follows that the combination of references fails to disclose that “the magnetron is disposed adjacent to the side surface at the lateral side of the heating chamber and adjacent an end of the side wave guide that is extended away from the upper wave guide” as claimed.

Regarding new claim 16, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable a microwave heating apparatus comprising “an L-like shape including a side waveguide extended upwardly along an outer side face at a lateral side of the heating chamber” and “an upper waveguide extended laterally across an outer face of the ceiling wall from an upper end of the side wave guide to the electricity feeding port.” The wave guide having an L-like shape in Yoshimura includes a waveguide extended upwardly along an outer

surface *at the rear* of the heating chamber, and not upwardly along *an outer side face at a lateral side* of the heating chamber, as claimed.

As shown in Yoshimura, cited as teaching the wave guide formed in an L-like shape, an access door 4 and knob 5 are provided at the front of the microwave. The L-like shape of the waveguide extends upwardly, parallel to the rear surface of the microwave, and forward in the depth dimension from the rear surface toward the front of the microwave. Locating the portion of the waveguide parallel to the rear surface as in Yoshimura adds otherwise unusable space in the depth dimension to the microwave. In contrast, the claimed invention includes a portion of the waveguide extended upwardly along *an outer side face at a lateral side* of the heating chamber.

The remaining references cited in combination in the Office action all fail to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable a wave guide formed in an L-like shape.

The remaining claims in the present application are also allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-38340.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Una L. Lauricia/
Una L. Lauricia – Reg. No. 48,998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: October 21, 2008